REMARKS

The non-final Office Action of April 16, 2010, rejects all pending claims 1-20. In this Amendment in Reply, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 10-11, and 14-15, and dependent claims 5-6, 9, 13, 16, and 19-20. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 3, line 22 – page 5, line 24. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims in view of the remarks set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2007/0250840 to Coker et al. ("the Coker reference") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0088700 to Lee et al. ("the Lee reference") and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0103174 to Balducci et al. ("the Balducci reference"). Claims 1, 10-11, and 14-15 are independent.

These rejections are rendered moot by the claim amendments above. However, Applicants do not concede the merits of these rejections.

Applicants' independent claims are patentable over the cited references because the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, at least, determining whether at least a threshold period of time has already elapsed while waiting for communication between a client device and a server to finish, and, upon determining that the threshold period of time has already elapsed, causing a message to be presented to a user of the client device, as provided in Applicants' independent claims.

As an illustrative example of Applicants' claimed subject matter, assume that a client device provides a user interface (e.g., a form with text fields) based on communication with a backend server system. For instance, the backend server system may instruct the client device to add and/or remove a text field from the interface. (*See* spec. 1:5-18). However, a "consequence of [such a configuration] may be that certain user-initiated events in the front end (such as pressing a button or editing a field) may [be received at the client but] no longer be permitted after the roundtrip [communication from the backend server]." (Spec. 1:14-16). To avoid this

potentially inconsistent input, the client device can be "blocked from receiving input during the roundtrip." (Spec. 1:16-18). When the roundtrip communication between a client and backend system takes a short period of time, "the user may not notice that input is being blocked." (Spec. 1:19-20) However, when the communication takes a longer period of time, it "may be distracting and confusing to the user if there is no indication of why input is being blocked." (Spec. 1:21-22). To balance between short roundtrips (when providing a message would likely annoy/distract a user) and long roundtrips (when a message would likely aid the user in understanding why he/she is unable to provide input to the interface), a client device can block input for all roundtrip communication with a backend system and only display a message to the user after a threshold period of time has elapsed while waiting for a response from the backend system. (*See* spec. 3:22-5:24).

Applicants' independent claims bear out aspects of this example. For example, independent claim 1 recites that "the client device configured to engage in communications with the server device for a plurality of application programs" and to "block[] the client device from receiving user input during the communications between the client device and the server device." Claim 1 further recites that the client device is configured to "determine[] whether at least a threshold period of time has already elapsed while waiting for each of the communications between the client device and the server device to finish, and, upon determining that the threshold period of time has already elapsed, causes a message . . . to be presented to a user of the client device."

Instead of providing a message in response to a threshold period of time having elapsed while waiting for a message from a server, the Coker reference is directed to providing a message in response to a notification received from a server. (*See* Coker at [0310]). For instance, the Coker reference discloses that:

> At block 4310, the client sends a request to a server. At block 4320, the server determines that the request may take a long time to process (e.g., the request involves long-running server operations, etc.). At block 4330, the server notifies the client that the request may take a long time to finish. In one embodiment, the server communicates this information to the client using the

> notification mechanism described above. At block 4340, the client locks the user interface and informs the user that the request processing has started and may take a long time to finish.

(*Id.*) (emphasis added).

As indicated in FIG. 43 and in paragraph [0310] of the Coker reference, the client locks the interface and provides a message (block 4340) only in response to receiving notification from the server that the request has been prospectively determined to take a long time. Nowhere does the Coker reference disclose or suggest determining whether at least a threshold period of time has already elapsed while waiting for communication between a client device and a server to finish, and, upon determining that the threshold period of time has already elapsed, causing a message to be presented to a user of the client device, as provided in Applicants' independent claims.

Additionally, the Coker reference discloses that a message is generated prospectively instead of in response to a threshold period of time having elapsed while waiting for communication to finish, as provided in Applicant's independent claims. (*See* Coker at [0310]). For example, the Coker reference provides that "At block 4320, the server determines that the request may take a long time to process (e.g., the request involves long-running server operations, etc.)." (*Id.*) (emphasis added). The Coker reference does not wait for a threshold period of time to elapse, but instead prospectively determines that a request may take a long period of time to process and sends notification to the client of the expected long processing time. In contrast, Applicants' independent claims explicitly recite determining whether at least a threshold period of time has already elapsed while waiting for communication between a client device and a server to finish, and, upon determining that the threshold period of time has already elapsed, causing a message to be presented to a user of the client device.

Applicants do not understand, nor does the Office Action suggest, that the other cited references cure the deficiencies of the Coker reference.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references. As such, Applicants respectfully request the rejections of

independent claims 1, 10-11, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as well as the rejections of their dependent claims, be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:July 16, 2010_____

/j richard soderberg reg. no. 43,352/_____
J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Customer Number 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945